

SUPERFLUID - BOSE-GLASS TRANSITION IN WEAKLY DISORDERED COMMENSURATE ONE-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEM

Boris V. Svistunov

Russian Research Center "Kurchatov Institute", 123182 Moscow, Russia

We study the effect of commensurability (integer filling factor) on the superfluid (SF) - Bose-glass (BG) transition in a one-dimensional disordered system in the limit of weak disorder, when the effect is most pronounced and, on the other hand, may be traced via the renormalization-group analysis. The equation for the SF-BG phase boundary demonstrating the effect of disorder-stimulated superfluidity implies that the strength of disorder sufficient to restore superfluidity from Mott insulator (MI) is much larger than that enough to turn MI into BG. Thus we provide an explicit proof of the fact that at arbitrarily small disorder the SF and MI phases are always separated by BG.

PACS numbers: 05.30.Jp, 64.60Ak, 67.40.-w

The problem of superfluid - insulator transitions in commensurate and disordered bosonic systems has attracted a lot of interest in the past decade (for an introduction see Refs. [1–3]). A special part in the analysis of the problem is played by one-dimensional (1D) systems, where along with the exact finite-size numerical treatment (quantum Monte Carlo [4,5] and exact diagonalization [6,7]) there exists macroscopic renormalization-group (RG) description [2]. [Recently it was demonstrated that the two are in an excellent agreement with each other at least in the case of SF-MI transition [8].] Note also a remarkable success of density-matrix RG study of 1D bosonic Hubbard model [9].

Despite the fact that now the understanding of superfluid - insulator transitions is close to being complete, especially in 1D, there is one point, however, which remains somewhat unclear up to now. That is the question of superfluid - insulator transition in a weakly disordered commensurate system with integer filling factor. From general considerations one would expect here that SF and MI phases are always separated by BG phase [3,10], while a number of approximate and exact (but finite-size!) methods suggest that small disorder is not relevant and there occurs a direct transition from SF to MI [11,12,9]. In this paper we consider this problem in 1D taking advantage of the asymptotically exact RG treatment.

Our main result is the demonstration of the existence of the BG phase at arbitrarily weak disorder. We provide the proof of this fact in a 'direct' and in an 'enhanced' forms. By 'direct' form we mean tracing the renormalization picture (in the superfluid phase, where the RG equations are asymptotically exact) with the observation that the commensurate scenario, taking place at smaller

scales of distance, is destroyed at larger distances by sufficiently strong disorder, in favor of the universal disordered scenario. [Incidentally, this accounts for the effect of disorder-stimulated superfluidity.] So that commensurability turns out to be irrelevant to any second-order-type transition arising with decreasing of the strength of disorder. The 'enhanced' proof does not rely on any assumption concerning the type of the transition leading to the destruction of superfluidity. We simply take the phase boundary for superfluid - insulator transition following from the 'direct' treatment as a lower boundary for the strength of disorder sufficient to support superfluidity, without specifying the phase adjacent to SF. Then we compare the result with that for the MI phase boundary, following from the exact relation between the minimal amount of disorder destroying MI and the insulating gap of the pure system [10]. The comparison shows that, in relative units, the separation between the boundaries is ever increasing with vanishing disorder, thus revealing the presence of BG between MI and SF.

The RG descriptions of the superfluid-to-insulator transitions in 1D were initially constructed in terms of the effective action for the long-wave density deviations [2,3], employing Haldane's representation of 1D bosons [13]. For our purposes, however, it is more convenient to use a dual treatment in terms of the effective action for the phase field [14]. This language directly takes into account effects of the collective backscattering off either commensurate or disordered potential, the corresponding instantons being just vortices in the phase field in (1+1) dimensions. As a result, the descriptions for the commensurate and disordered cases turn out to be very close to each other. The only difference is that in the disordered case one deals with 'vertical' vortex-antivortex pairs (the spatial coordinates of vortex, x_1 , and antivortex, x_2 , coincide up to some microscopic length), because contributions of non-vertical pairs are averaged out due to the random phase associated with the pair:

$$\gamma(x_1, x_2) = -2\pi \int_{x_1}^{x_2} n_0(x) dx, \quad (1)$$

where $n_0(x)$ is the expectation of the density at the point x [14]. In the weak-disorder limit $n_0(x)$ is related to the disordered potential, $\tilde{W}(x)$, perturbatively:

$$n_0(x) = n^{(0)}(x) + \int dx' S(x', x) \tilde{W}(x'), \quad (2)$$

where $n^{(0)}(x)$ and $S(x', x)$ are the density expectation and static susceptibility for the pure system.

$$S(x', x) = i \int_0^\infty dt \langle [n(x', t), n(x, 0)] \rangle, \quad (3)$$

n is the density operator. Substituting (2) into (1) and taking into account that in the integer-filling case the contribution from $n^{(0)}(x)$ leads only to some irrelevant renormalizations [14], we get

$$\gamma(x_1, x_2) = -2\pi \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx Q(x) \tilde{W}(x), \quad (4)$$

where

$$Q(x) = \int dx' S(x, x') \quad (5)$$

is a periodic (commensurate) function. [In Eq.(4) $|x_2 - x_1|$ is meant to be much greater than the microscopic static correlation radius characterizing the decay of $S(x', x)$ as a function of $|x - x'|$.]

For definiteness, we take $\tilde{W}(x)$ to be bounded,

$$-W/2 \leq \tilde{W}(x) \leq W/2, \quad (6)$$

and symmetric with respect to the change of the sign.

Introducing the radius of a vortex pair

$$R = \sqrt{(x_2 - x_1)^2 + (y_2 - y_1)^2}, \quad (7)$$

y_1 (y_2) being the coordinate of the vortex (antivortex) along the imaginary-time axis ($y = c\tau$, c is the sound velocity, τ is the imaginary time), we see from Eq.(4) that the mean-root-square value of the phase associated with a pair of the radius R is

$$\gamma_R \sim W\sqrt{R}. \quad (8)$$

[From now on we treat W and R as dimensionless quantities, assuming them to be measured in units of characteristic interparticle energy and distance, respectively.] While $\gamma_R \ll 1$, the disorder is irrelevant and the renormalization picture follows the scenario of the pure commensurate case. At the scale

$$R_* \sim 1/W^2, \quad (9)$$

corresponding to $\gamma_{R_*} \sim 1$, the renormalization picture crosses over to the disordered scenario which becomes well-developed at $R \gg R_*$, when only the vertical pairs ($|y_2 - y_1| \gg |x_2 - x_1| \sim R_*$) contribute. The scale R_* itself plays negligible role in the renormalization, since near the critical point in 1D the total contribution comes from exponentially large range of distances. We thus can simply sew together the known RG descriptions [2] (see also [3,14]) for the purely commensurate and the purely disordered cases:

$$\frac{dK}{d\lambda} = w^2, \quad \frac{dw}{d\lambda} = (2 - 1/K)w \quad (\lambda \leq \lambda_*); \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{dK}{d\lambda} = Kw^2, \quad \frac{dw}{d\lambda} = (3/2 - 1/K)w \quad (\lambda \geq \lambda_*). \quad (11)$$

Here $\lambda = \ln R$, $\lambda_* = \ln R_*$; $K = [\pi\sqrt{\Lambda_s\kappa}]^{-1}$ (Λ_s is the superfluid stiffness, κ is the compressibility). The quantity $[w(\lambda)]^2$ is proportional to the number of vortex pairs of the size $\sim R$ in the area $\sim R^2$ of the xy -plane [14], and is much less than unity in the region of applicability of Eqs.(10)-(11). Strictly speaking, $w(\lambda)$ experiences a jump at $\lambda = \lambda_*$, but this is not important for our consideration.

The critical value of $K(\lambda = \infty)$ for the destruction of superfluidity (divergency of $K(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$) is 1/2 in the commensurate case [15,13,2] and 2/3 in the disordered one [2]. Hence, if $K(\lambda_*) < 2/3$, then it may turn out that $K(\infty) < 2/3$ also, and the system is in the superfluid phase though in the pure case it would be Mott insulator. In the weak-disorder limit one may neglect the difference between $K(\infty)$ and $K(\lambda_*)$, provided the system is in SF phase [that is neglect the renormalization of K due to disorder]. The critical condition for the SF-BG transition then reads

$$K(\lambda_*) = 2/3. \quad (12)$$

To reveal the behavior of $K(\lambda_*)$ as a function of the Hamiltonian parameters consider the solution of the system (10)-(11) near the critical value $K = 1/2$ from the Mott-insulator side:

$$K = \frac{1}{2} + a \tan[4a\lambda - \pi/2] \quad (|K - \frac{1}{2}| \ll 1). \quad (13)$$

[A free constant in the argument of the tangent is fixed to be $-\pi/2$ (up to a small uncertainty on the order $a \ll 1$) by the condition that at the microscopic scale $\lambda \sim 1$ the parameter $K(\lambda)$ should be noticeably smaller than its mesoscopic value 1/2.] Near the critical point the quantity a depends on the parameters of the Hamiltonian of the pure system in the square-root fashion:

$$a \propto \sqrt{p/p_0 - 1}. \quad (14)$$

Here p is any parameter of the Hamiltonian, the value $p = p_0$ corresponding to the point of SF-MI transition in the pure system ($p > p_0$ in the Mott phase). For example, one may choose p to be the strength of interparticle interaction.

From Eq.(13) it is seen that $K(\lambda)$ does not differ essentially from 1/2 until λ comes closely to the point $\pi/4a$. At this point K diverges and we thus conclude that to a good accuracy

$$\lambda_* = \frac{\pi}{4a}. \quad (15)$$

A comment is in order here concerning the usage of Eq.(13) at $K = 2/3$, i.e. out of the region of its formal applicability. Actually, at this value of K Eq.(13) yields

only a rough order-of-magnitude estimate. This roughness, however, is essentially compensated by the sharp behavior of $K(\lambda)$ in the vicinity of the point $\lambda = \pi/4a$. So that the relative uncertainty of the value of λ_* is easily estimated to be on the order $a \ll 1$.

Combining Eqs. (9), (14), and (15) we obtain the equation for the phase boundary between superfluid and Bose glass [$W = W_{\text{SF-BG}}(p)$]:

$$W_{\text{SF-BG}}(p) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{8b\sqrt{p/p_0-1}}\right), \quad (16)$$

where b is some constant. Eq.(16) demonstrates the effect of disorder-stimulated superfluidity in the vicinity of the SF-MI transition of the pure commensurate system, which was observed previously in numerical studies [11,9]. Note a very sharp behavior of the critical value of p for the SF-BG transition as a function of the strength of disorder.

To provide the 'enhanced' proof of the existence of the BG in the weak disorder limit we compare Eq.(16) with the equation for the phase boundary between MI and a gapless phase (which subsequently will be identified with BG; until this is done the notations MI-BG and SF-BG should be understood as a convention). To obtain the latter equation one can take advantage of the exact relation taking place at the MI phase boundary [10]:

$$\Delta = W, \quad (17)$$

where Δ is the insulating gap of the pure system. This relation follows from the fact that the infinitesimal destruction of the MI is due to the most favorable exchange of particles between exponentially rare Lifshitz's regions, where local configurations of disorder mimic uniform potential of the value $W/2$ or $-W/2$ [3,10]. An estimate for Δ one can obtain from the relation $\Delta \sim 1/R_*$ [3]. So we have

$$W_{\text{MI-BG}}(p) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{4b\sqrt{p/p_0-1}}\right) \quad (18)$$

and see that

$$\frac{W_{\text{SF-BG}}(p)}{W_{\text{MI-BG}}(p)} \sim \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{8b\sqrt{p/p_0-1}}\right) \gg 1. \quad (19)$$

Hence, in a weakly disordered commensurate 1D system the strength of disorder sufficient to restore superfluidity is exponentially larger than that enough to turn Mott insulator into a gapless phase. This immediately proves the existence of BG between SF and MI, and identifies (16) and (18) with corresponding phase boundaries. Ultimately, this effect is due to the fact that Δ scales like $1/R_*$, while the critical amplitude of disorder supporting superfluidity is $\sim 1/\sqrt{R_*}$.

Let us now discuss recent results of numerical density-matrix RG study of 1D commensurate disordered bosonic Hubbard model [9]. In the weakly disordered case the authors observe a direct transition from SF to MI, in contrast to the case of a substantial disorder where BG intervenes between SF and MI, and to our asymptotically exact (at $W \rightarrow 0$) analytical results.

It is known, however, that in the limit of weak disorder it is difficult to distinguish BG from MI by a finite-size scaling, because the difference is associated with exponentially rare Lifshitz's regions [3,10]. If the size of the system is not large enough, these regions are simply absent with probability close to unity, and the scaling analysis reveals nothing. [Maximal size of the system in Ref. [9] is of the order of 100 sites.]

Therefore, one may suspect that the transition observed in Ref. [9] at a small disorder is actually the SF-to-BG one. In this connection it is interesting to compare the numerical data with Eq.(16). Unfortunately, the phase diagram in Ref. [9] contains only few points in the weak-disorder region, too little to make possible an unambiguous fitting. However, one may check a non-trivial qualitative prediction of Eq.(16), the requirement that the strength of disorder on the SF-BG phase boundary be much larger than the Mott gap in the absence of disorder. The data clearly demonstrate this feature. At any of the three presented points on the superfluid - insulator phase boundary in the weak-disorder region the strength of disorder is at least an order of magnitude larger than the insulating gap.

We can allow also for the effect of a small deviation from commensurability. To this end we should add to the right-hand side of Eq.(4) the term $2\pi\delta n^{(0)}(x_1 - x_2)$, where $\delta n^{(0)}$ is the deviation of the density from the commensurate value. This term is negligible for a vortex pair of a radius much less than

$$R_c \sim |\delta\nu|^{-1} \quad (20)$$

($\delta\nu$ is the deviation of the filling factor), and leads to the cancellation of contributions of pairs with radii $R_c < R < R_*$, provided $R_c < R_*$. At $R_c > R_*$ this term plays no role at all. Hence, at $R_c < R_*$, we just need to replace λ_* by $\ln R_c$ in Eq.(10) and set $K(\lambda_*) = K(\ln R_c)$ as the initial condition for Eq.(11). Consequently, for the SF-BG phase boundary we obtain the equation

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{4b\sqrt{p/p_0-1}}\right) \sim \max\{W^2, |\delta\nu|\} \quad (21)$$

Note that in the variables p and $\delta\nu$ (at fixed W) the phase boundary has an independent of W cusp-like shape except for the tip of the cusp cut off by disorder.

A remark is in order here concerning fractional filling factors. The fact that the point of SF-MI transition of a pure commensurate system turns out to be the limiting point for both SF-BG and BG-MI phase boundaries

of the disordered system is characteristic of only integer filling factors, because only in this case the critical value of the parameter K for the pure system, $K = 1/2$, is less than that of disordered system, $K = 2/3$. In the vicinity of SF-MI transition at a fractional filling, where the transition occurs at $K = q^2/2$ (q is the denominator of the filling factor) [15,13], an infinitesimal disorder takes the system away from the superfluid region.

Summarizing, we have presented a description of the superfluid - Bose-glass phase boundary in 1D weakly disordered system near the point of superfluid - Mott-insulator transition of the pure system with integer filling factor. The results demonstrate the effect of stimulation of superfluidity by disorder, previously observed numerically. In the limit of weak disorder the strength of disorder sufficient to restore superfluidity from Mott insulator turns out to be much larger than that enough to turn Mott insulator into Bose glass. This provides an explicit proof of the fact that at arbitrarily small disorder the Bose glass always intervene between superfluid and Mott phases.

The author is grateful to V.Kashurnikov, N.Prokof'ev, and J.Freericks for valuable discussions.

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (under Grant No. 95-02-06191a) and by the Grant INTAS-93-2834-ext [of the European Community].

(1992).

- [13] F.D.M.Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett., **47**, 1840 (1981).
- [14] V.A.Kashurnikov, A.I.Podlivaev, N.V.Prokof'ev, and B.V.Svistunov, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 13091 (1996).
- [15] S.Coleman, Phys. Rev., **D11**, 2088 (1975);
S.T.Chui and P.A.Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett., **35**, 315 (1975).

-
- [1] M.Ma, B.I.Halperin, and P.A.Lee, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 3136 (1986).
 - [2] T.Giamarchi and H.J.Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 325 (1988).
 - [3] M.P.A.Fisher, P.B.Weichman, G.Grinstein, and D.S.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 546 (1989).
 - [4] G.G.Batrouni, R.T.Scalettar, and G.T.Zimanyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1765 (1990);
G.G.Batrouni and R.T.Scalettar, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 9051 (1992).
 - [5] M.Makivic, N.Trivedi, and S.Ullah, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2307 (1993).
 - [6] K.G.Runge, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 1316 (1992).
 - [7] V.A.Kashurnikov, A.I.Podlivaev, and B.V.Svistunov, Pis'ma v Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz. **61**, 375 (1995) [JETP Lett. **61**, 381 (1995)].
 - [8] V.A.Kashurnikov and B.V.Svistunov, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 11776 (1996).
 - [9] R.V.Pai, R.Pandit, H.R.Krishnamurthy, and S.Ramasesha, Phys. Rev. Lett., **76**, 2937 (1996).
 - [10] J.K.Freericks and H.Monien, Phys. Rev. B, **53**, 2691 (1996).
 - [11] W.Krauth, N.Trivedi, and D.Ceperley, Phys. Rev. Lett., **67**, 2307 (1991).
 - [12] K.G.Singh and D.S.Rokhsar, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 3002